

## REMARKS

With entry of this amendment, claims 1-49 remain pending in the application.

### Claim Rejections Based Upon 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office rejected claims 7-8, 30 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter not described in the specification so as to convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 7-8, 30 and 32 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claims the subject matter regarded as the invention.

The specification has been amended to include the terminology from the rejected claims. Since this terminology was in the originally filed claims, it does not constitute new matter. Applicant requests that the § 112 rejections can be withdrawn.

### Claim Rejections Based Upon 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6, 9-10, 15-29, 31, and 36-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,072,864 (Shtivelman et al.). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claims 1, 15, 22, and 36 require an SCP configured to receive and process a message with a speed dial number to generate a message with call handling information.

Shtivelman does not disclose an SCP configured as such. Rather, Shtivelman discloses T-server at a call center that determines a call transfer number (col. 7, lines 20-26). Shtivelman requires complex and expensive equipment at the call center to determine the call transfer number.

Conversely, independent claims 1, 15, 22, and 36 recite an SCP that receives and processes a

messages to determine call handling information without the necessity of complex and expensive equipment required by Shtivelman.

Dependent claims 2-6, 9-10, 16-29, 31, 37-42, and 44-49 each recite further limitations that render these claims separately patentable over the prior art. However, because the limitations of base claims 1, 15, 22, 36, and 43 are sufficient to distinguish Shtivelman, the rejections based upon 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) are traversed.

### **Claim Rejections Based Upon 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Dependent Claims 11-14 and 33-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shtivelman et al., in view of U.S. Patent No. 5, 768,360 (Reynolds, et al.). While claims 11-14 and 33-35 each recite further limitations that render these separately patentable over the prior art, a discussion is not necessary because the limitations of base claims 1 and 22 are sufficient to distinguish Shtivelman in view of Reynolds.

### CONCLUSION

The claims in their present form are allowable over the art of record. Applicant therefore solicits their allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Stephen S. Roche, Reg. No. 52,176

Phone: (303) 546-1300

Fax: (303) 449-5426

**CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:**

**Customer No. 028004**

**Marked-Up Version of Amended Paragraph**

(AMENDED) The consult leg call (call from first called party to a second called party) is extended to the second called party. If the first called party drops from the call, the second called party may, if eligible, redirect the call to another called party. At any point where a party receiving a call may ~~have~~have call redirection capability, it is possible for that party to conduct any number of consult leg calls, one after another. Such a consult leg call or further redirect would involve an SCP receiving a fifth message and processing the fifth message to generate a sixth message containing third call handling information.